

Yet another boring leaflet?

Leaflets are generally used to repeat the same banalities, to serve as publicity for trade union and political groups, and ignoring the essential: the horrible future that awaits us, if the tendency to avoid confronting the disquieting present persists.

The times are confusing. The constraints on movements exercised by the unions are nothing new. What is new, however, are the current constraints put on *critique* of the unions, accepted as such by the majority.

The unions as the main obstacle to the development of self-organized struggles ...

Recently, in the "movement" against the Labor Law, the role played, for the umpteenth time, by the unions, corresponded well to their social function. It is not surprising that bureaucratic apparatuses, having been integrated into the state apparatus for decades through representative and joint bodies, organize their strikes on the least-busy workdays, limit them to a duration of 24 hours, avoid promoting General Assemblies open to other sectors so as to break up corporatist separations, or negotiate in secret.

Behind their arguments for the defense of public services and thus of "the general interest", so-called "social gains" (it is admittedly normal in some cases not to allow them to take away the little we have, but the "acquired gains" remain concessions made to the exploited when their mobilizations reached a certain scale, most often to calm them down, and if possible to make them participate even more in their own exploitation through co-management), the CGT and the other unions mainly intend to defend their negotiating bodies (Works Committees since 1945, Administrative Committees since 1958, union delegates, CHSCT, etc.), so that they can continue to support the reforms promoted by the State for the good health of Capital, as they've always done ever since these state reforms started. Even during the famous case of the ordinances¹ (which did not bother the leftists in 1945 at the time of the agreements between De Gaulle and the Communist Party ratifying health insurance and tripartite management), Macron did not fail to consult the unions.

Since 1995, "social movements", emphasising a typically "citizenist" assertion of public services useful for everybody, are times when the state takes the pulse of these movements in order to negotiate with its partners, the unions.

After '68 and the Grenelle agreements, it was at least clear to many that the CGT and the other unions were bureaucratic machines, which could do nothing other than put a stop to self-organization and revolution. This role has been steadily strengthened afterwards, with the CGT negotiating at a high level, as much in the nuclear field as in the measures constantly imposed by the state in order to overcome advances made in autonomous struggles.

SUD spreads its image of a union that is better able to integrate people who are more rebellious, less politicos. But its role as negotiators remains within the general logic. For example, concerning nuclear power, SUD talks about a gradual withdrawal from nuclear energy without saying anything about the uses of *military* nuclear energy; SUD also speaks of alternative energy, etc., but, like the CGT, presents candidates for the Board of Directors of the Atomic Energy Commissariat (CEA). Such a radical union!

¹ Ordinances : whereby the government, despite the spectacle of opposition to its « undemocratic » nature by both leftis parties and the unions, bypassed parliament and ratified the reforms without any debate or vote in the National Assembly.

The 2006 anti-CPE movement was a start, a momentary victory. But it did not durably encourage people to go on to fight more. There is no victory in this society if self-organization does not come out of the struggle to reinforce them, if they do not intensify and deepen their critiques, if they do not extend beyond their place and their original context.

Thus the last few years have been particularly morose, and it is all the worse because of the giant steps advanced by dominant ideology: increasing precarity meets the increasing ideology of money, the strengthening of separations (with the triumph of pseudo-identities, reducing individuals and their complexity to categories that are valued by business and politics, based on sexuality, skin color, or their origins), "I-don't-give-a-fuck"ism - active or passive nihilism consisting in not giving a fuck for anything since that's the way things are and we can't do anything about it.

"Unity" as a false remedy

For current militants (ie those who have a church to defend), the remedy for this situation is to be found in unity and the famous "convergence of struggles". The convergence of struggles is a hollow expression, meaningless, since there is nothing to converge with apart from political and/or trade union groups seeking a momentary unity for objectives that look towards them.

For us, who are not part of it, and seek to get rid of our chains, the ideology of unity is mainly used to tolerate this world and to submit to it; it's a concept that organized racketeers use so as to say "Shut up" to discordant and minority voices.

"Unity", justified by the argument that one must not separate oneself, be a minority, serves above all to get as many people as possible caught up in the dominant logic, and, when it works, paralyzes initiatives, by directing people's energies towards the classic methods of representation and negotiation, against all aspects of the autonomy of those who revolt. It prevents any discussion, any possibility for individuals to exchange opinions and to go beyond their limits, their illusions, by giving them the false feeling of being part of something, while they are just its playthings. And being described as "sectarian" is quickly used to avoid taking into account what is relevant in anything that dares not blindly accept everything that passes for an "Opposition".

It is only with debate and criticism that those who revolt – proletarians - can glimpse new possibilities, conceive of the project to get rid of this society, and start working on it.

We are not weak because we are divided, but divided because we are weak.

It is necessary that these movements go beyond symbolism, towards a critique of politics and the roles it legitimises. We need moments when we go beyond social roles. Nobody can believe that private sector workers are really ready to mobilize themselves to defend "public services", a category that encloses the exploited in their role as sacrosanct defenders of everybody's interests, instead of defending their own interests, and seeking to link up with others.

Recent events

Over the last weeks, at Notre-Dame-des-Landes, where a certain rejection of this social reality has occurred in recent years, with inevitable, sometimes really heavy, contradictions, the ideology of unity also served, once again, to break the initiatives that went outside and beyond the self-appointed representatives' plan to negotiate with the state whilst affirming the contrary, shouting loudly about "insurrection". It was the construction of alternatives that was being affirmed, and not

opposition seeking to extend to the whole of the social terrain, when self-proclaimed representatives prepared the ground for the cops, starting their disgusting job of repression and evictions.

At the University of Montpellier: unity against the "fascism" of the Dean and his minions, served, once again, to ask the authorities for the restoration of true "justice", a truly democratic operation. But to demand the State recognise its errors, to claim a just "justice", is to recognize the prerogatives of the State, to legitimize its controlling and exploitative role, from which it is comprised. Meanwhile, at the university, courses continue, in a more or less self-organized manner, but without overcoming teacher/student roles, without criticizing the nature of academic subjects and developing an interest in discussions involving critiques of authority relations.

However actions also escape [dominant] "logic", such as the sabotage of the University's computer system on April 11.

We certainly live in a difficult atmosphere: ecological catastrophe, threats of war, intensified repression of everything that is human (even including the simplest of pleasures), increased confusion and isolation, of separated people's ego battles, crazy addictions and depression. Resignation leads to acceptance of this society, lack of self-confidence and confidence in others.

We must criticize, in words and deeds, what creates and what justifies this state of affairs, the compensations of culture and consumerism that this society holds out to us as anesthetics to divert us from the poverty of our daily lives.

We can't wait to be saved by a movement which we only contribute towards as followers, as spectators. History is not a force external to individuals, and there is a need to try to understand the forces and weaknesses of the movements of the past, to try out new endeavours, without seeking perfection, but more as a way which allows us to conceive of something else.



"Retirement at 25", "€10,000 minimum wage"

For a movement of riots, wildcat strikes, sabotage and occupations everywhere!